DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 352 522 CE 062 678

TITLE	Sanford, Maine Public Schools National Workplace Literacy Program. Performance Report. March 1, 1991 to June 26, 1992.
INSTITUTION	Sanford Public Schools, ME.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Vocational and Adult Education (ED), Washington, DC. National Workplace Literacy Program.
PUB DATE	26 Jun 92
CONTRACT	V198A10215
NOTE	25p.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Basic Education; *Adult Literacy; *Cooperative Programs; *Education Work Relationship; Evaluation Criteria; Institutional Cooperation; *Literacy Education; *Outcomes of Education; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *School Business Relationship
IDENTIFIERS	Sanford Public Schools ME; *Workplace Literacy

ABSTRACT

An evaluation was conducted of the workplace literacy program developed through a partnership among the Sanford (Maine) Public Schools and three employers. During the project, 859 employees were recruited, tested, evaluated, and counseled, with 340 receiving extensive evaluation and counseling and an Individual Education Plan (IEP). Through language and mathematics classes, 88 percent of the participants increased at least one level in the language classes and 75 percent increased at least one level in the mathematics classes (lower than the project's target of 90 percent increasing at least one level). Almost all project participants retained their employment, and most were made eligible for advanced training after completion of the program. However, only about one-fourth of the participants qualified for career advancement and a very small number improved their job performance. The project was rated successful by the project coordinator and an outside evaluator for the following reasons: it developed a teaching plan to meet the companies' needs, it enrolled students who would normally not have attended classes outside the workplace, it resulted in many students working toward the completion of a high school diploma, and relationships between business and education and between the companies and their employees improved. (The outside evaluator's report is included in the document.) (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED352522

Sanford Maine Public Schools
Sanford Adult Education
2 R Main Street
Sanford, Maine 04073

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERFORMANCE REPORT
P/R AWARD #V198A10215

March 1,1991 to June 26,1992

The following contains a comparison and statement of actual accomplishments of objectives contained in the application and grant listed above. There are thirteen stated goals and objectives.

#1. The first goal was successfully achieved. We enlisted and developed a partnership cooperation with 3 local employers. The Baker Company, Jagger Brothers, and Vishay-Sprague actively participated within their respective workforces to arrange and hold workplace class instruction during the stated grant period.

#2 through #5. It must be noted, at this time, that these goals and objectives were successfully achieved. In fact, more students were enrolled than actually called for in the grant. There is a discrepancy, however, in the number of students found at the particular level stated in the original grant. The approved application calls for identifying and serving twenty (20) low level participants at level 0-4, and sixty-four (64) participants at level 5-12 in the skill areas of reading and writing. In the area of math, the application calls for forty-seven (47)

at level 0-4 and one hundred twenty-two (122) at level 5-12. After administering the initial placement tests to the employees, we found the basic skill areas to be much lower than we had originally anticipated. Therefore, the majority of participants we served were at the 0-4 level in both language and math. Vishay-Sprague, the largest partner, decided to test the entire production department of approximately eight hundred and fifty (850) employees. This was not originally stated in the grant. It was decided and agreed upon that this decision would best suit their needs and we agreed that it could be part of the process. After reviewing the results of the testing, Vishay-Sprague decided to begin with the lower level employees first and, after everyone had reached a higher level, include the higher level employees at a later date. This explains why the grant figures are off from the figures originally called for in the approved application. The grant originally called for seventy-five (75) employees to be identified as students with limited English proficiency. After initial testing, we were able to mainstream approximately half of the ESL students into the regular language classes. Many of the employees had taken ESL classes before and had achieved a higher level of English proficiency to be considered for the regular English classes. Many of these students received a sense of pride when they were told they could go to school with

the others in the regular language classes. This decision not only removed the frustration level of an advanced ESL student forced to take yet another ESL class, but helped reduce class sizes in ESL to better serve the lower level ESL student needing more individualized attention.

Listed below is the breakdown of actual numbers for the objectives #2 through #5.

	Grant Requirements	Actual Enrolled	Over/Under
READING/ WRITING			
Levl 0-4 LU (AA-C)	20	115	+95
Level 5-12 LU (D-G)	64	11	-53
TOTAL	84	126	+42
MATH			
Level 0-4 LU (A-B)	47	185	+138
Level 5-12 LU (C-G)	122	1	-121
TOTAL	169	186	+17
Limited English Proficiency	75	28	-47

#6. This objective was achieved in that we did meet our numbers of participants originally stated in the grant. In actuality, we recruited, tested, evaluated and counseled eight hundred and fifty-nine (859) student employees. Out of the 859, we were able to serve three

hundred forty (340). This smaller group received extensive evaluation and counseling as to their educational format.

#7. We did achieve this objective. The requirement called for three hundred twenty-eight (328) student employees to receive an Individual Education Plan (IEP). We created IEP's for three hundred forty (340) student employees. At this time, we need to state that we were quite satisfied with our delivery system, LEARNING UNLIMITED. This system quite effectively created, through a process of placement tests and diagnostic testing, a computerized IEP in math and language. This form was easy to read and the student, as well as the teacher, was able to follow along and plot progress during the instuctional period. The student felt a real sense of pride as each level of mastery was completed. This encouraged many students to work at a more rapid pace. The computerized form lists all the skill areas mastered and not mastered. This form was used as a very effective counseling tool as it was a focus on what strengths and weaknesses the student has and how this was tied in with his/her specific goals.

#8. The eighth objective calls for ninety percent (90%) of the student employees who completed the IEP to raise at least one level. A point of clarification is necessary

here to explain exactly what is involved in the IEP and the completion process. The concept of levels needs to be clarified at the same time.

Each student is issued an IEP which lists all levels of mastery. There are eight levels in language and seven levels in math. The levels of our targeted student employees were very low initially. Vishay-Sprague, by the time they completed testing of the entire production department not to mention some internal problems dealing with a company buy-out, did not begin class teaching until February. It was impossible for anyone to complete the IEP. We did have one student at Baker Company complete both the math and language IEP. In addition, we had three more students complete the language IEP. In all these cases, these students raised more than one level on the IEP. We did have much success in raising the levels of the majority of the student employees that attended class instruction. The figures listed below show the breakdown of students and the numbers who raised at least one level. The number of students that increased more than one level is also listed. The breakdown of test results of the students in the ESL classes is also listed. The ESL students were administered the BEST TEST as a pre-test. After the grant period ended, these students were given another version of the BEST TEST. The figures below show the numbers of students that increased or decreased their scores on the post-test.

LANGUAGE LEVELS

A break down of the numbers of participants by company and the number of levels they increased.

# LEVELS	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Sprague	15	44	34	15	1	1	0
Baker	0	3	1	3	1	2	0
Jagger	1	1	1	3	0	0	0
TOTAL (126)	16	48	36	21	2	3	0

MATH LEVELS

A break down of the numbers of participants by company and the number of levels they increased.

# LEVELS	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Sprague	45	92	33	3	1	0	0
Baker	1	1	3	1	1	0	0
Jagger	0	1	2	1	1	0	0
TOTAL (186)	46	94	38	5	3	0	0

ESL LEVELS

A break down of ESL students and the results of the numbers of points they increased or decreased (-1 to -6) as a result of the retesting of the BEST TEST at the end of the grant period.

Company	(-1/-6) Pts	+2/+4 Pts	+5/+8 Pts	+10/+13 Pts	Stayed Same	Absent Retest
SPRAGUE & JAGGER	4	12	7	2	1	2
TOTAL (28)	4	12	7	2	1	2

In reviewing the above tables, it must be noted that eighty-eight percent (88%) of the participants increased at least one level in the language classes. In the math classes, however, the percentage was lower or seventy-five percent (75%). In conclusion, we did not meet our objectives of ninety percent (90%) of participants increasing at least one level. To clarify the point

further, it must be noted that in level A math, there are 26 skill areas or lessons to be studied and retested. During a typical class session, a student could complete two to three skill areas. Many of the 25%, who did not raise one level, are very near to completing the first level. Many of these students were studying the material for the first time. We did identify students with learning differences. The teachers spent a great deal of time working with these students in hopes of discovering how they learned and what they can learn. We were able to pair two students with individual tutors outside the classroom through the Goodall Library Literacy Program. Others refused this service and dropped out. We are very sensitive to this issue and had much success in turning people on to the education process. Unfortunately, we cannot reach everyone. Finally, it must be noted that the above figures happened as a result of the decision made by our partner, Vishay-Sprague, as to the enrollment policy. They requested all students needing levels A and B in math and levels A through D in language be served first. Upon completion of these levels of instruction, the company will authorize additional instruction at the higher levels. We did not agree with this request. They felt that this decision best filled their need to have all employees finished with level A and B before going on to the higher levels. We respected the decision. Students

were permitted to attend classes on their own time at the higher levels. A few took advantage of this option but there were no great numbers affected.

At this time, it is relevant to list the breakdown of students by sex, ethnic background, marital status, age and education. This breakdown is listed below.

AGE	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
MATH SESSIONS			
16-24	6	9	15
25-44	38	62	100
45-59	11	45	56
60+	1	5	6
NO INFO GIVEN	1	8	9
SUB TOTAL	57	129	186
LANGUAGE SESSIONS			
16-24	7	6	13
25-44	37	29	66
45-59	5	19	24
60+	1	6	7
NO INFO GIVEN	5	11	16
SUB TOTAL	55	71	126
MATH	57	129	186
LANGUAGE	55	71	126
ESL	8	20	28
TOTAL	120	220	340

ETHNIC ORIGIN	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
MATH SESSIONS			
AMERICAN INDIAN	1.5	1	2.5
ASIAN	5	3	8
BLACK	0	0	0
HISPANIC	1	6	7
WHITE	44.5	112	156.5
NO INFO GIVEN	5	7	12
SUB TOTAL	57	129	186
LANGUAGE SESSIONS			
AMERICAN INDIAN	1	0	1
ASIAN	19	9	28
BLACK	0	0	0
HISPANIC	0	0	0
WHITE	32	53	85
NO INFO GIVEN	3	9	12
SUB TOTAL	55	71	126
MATH	57	129	186
LANGUAGE	55	71	126
TOTAL	112	200	312

SCHOOL CREDENTIALS

MATH SESSIONS	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
HS DIPLOMA	23	69	92
GED-YES	0	10	10
DIP/GED-NO	25	41	66
FOREIGN DIP	0	0	0
NO INFO GIVEN	9	9	18
SUB TOTAL	57	129	186

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

LANGUAGE SESSIONS

HS DIPLOMA	21	35	56
GED-YES	2	3	5
DIP/GED-NO	24	19	43
FOREIGN DIP	5	0	5
NO INFO GIVEN	3	14	17
SUB TOTAL	55	71	126
MATH	57	129	186
LANGUAGE	55	71	126
TOTAL	112	200	312

MARITAL STATUS

MATH SESSIONS	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
Single	11	28	39
Married	32	68	100
Widowed	0	4	4
Divorced	4	11	15
Separated	0	2	2
No Info Given	10	16	26
SUB TOTAL	57	129	186

LANGUAGE SESSIONS	MALE	FEMALE	TOTAL
Single	16	9	25
Married	32	38	70
Widowed	0	7	7
Divorced	1	4	5
Separated	1	0	1
No Info Given	5	13	18
SUB TOTAL	55	71	126
MATH	57	129	186
LANGUAGE	55	71	126
TOTAL	112	200	312

#9. The ninth objective calls for the affirmation of any employees who received an increase in literacy levels to earn a diploma or GED or credit toward these credentials. I feel that we were successful in this goal considering our limitations within the workplace. All student employees that need credits for high school diplomas are receiving these credits based on the idea of receiving one credit for every forty-five hours instruction. When a student reaches a higher level of mastery in language or math, we recommend they take the pre-GED test. If scores are high enough, we recommend they take the regular GED. We had one person receive a GED in this way during the first grant. In the second grant period, there will be a significantly higher number of people receiving their High School Diploma and GED. The numbers will increase as people are allowed to master the higher levels of math and language.

The last four objectives of the grant are directly related to the response we received from the partners of the project. A rating sheet was developed and distributed to the supervisors for a response. The questions and answers are tabulated and listed below. Out of the 340 sheets prepared, we only received 244 replies.

RATING SHEET QUESTIONS
(and the tabulated responses)

1.	Is the participant listed above presently employed?	Yes (229)	No (2)	No Response (13)
2.	Will this participant be eligible for more advanced training after completion of this program?	Yes (207)	No (11)	No Response (26)
3.	Did this participant receive or qualify for career advancement?	Yes (54)	No (155)	No Response (35)
4.	Did this participant give proof of improved job performance and productivity as a result of this course?	Yes (14)	No (194)	No Response (36)

#10. The tenth objective calls for ninety-five percent (95%) of the present student population to raise levels enough to continue employment. Out of the responses, we found that ninety-three percent (93%) of the student population did continue employment. We were not able to confirm that they continued employment because of increased job skills.

#11. The eleventh objective calls for seventy-five percent (75%) of employees who completed the IEP to qualify for company advanced training. The response showed that eighty-five percent (85%) did qualify for the company advanced training programs.

#12. The twelfth objective asks how many employees received or qualified for company advancements. We projected the figure to be fifty percent (50%). The actual figure turned out to be twenty-two percent (22%)

#13. The thirteenth objective calls for proof of improved job performance and productivity. We projected fifty percent (50%). The actual figure is five percent (5%). we were not successful in reaching the last four goals and objectives. It appears to be very difficult to prove the direct impact of the courses on the performance of the employees' jobs.

As Project Coordinator, I have to say that this project was successful for the following reasons.

1. We addressed the companys' needs and developed a teaching plan to fill these needs.

2. We raised literacy levels of the participants.

3. We had students enrolled in the program that normally would not have considered attending classes offered outside the workplace.

4. Many students are working toward the completion of credits toward a High School Diploma and GED.

5. We took 340 workers out of production for two hours a week and production levels did not decrease.

6. We successfully developed our staff to recognize and work with students with different learning styles and, as a result, we enhanced the self-esteem of the students.

7. We changed attitudes of students and opened up their minds to the positive sides of education.

8. We helped our business partners to understand more fully what their employees needed and the relationship between employees and the company was enhanced.

9. Because of the good reputation of the project and the endorsement of the partners, we solicited and increased the numbers of our partners for a second grant.

10. The teachers, by the merits of their personal style and expertise, bonded with the students and developed relationships that proved vital to the personal empowerment of the student employees.

11. We helped improve the language and dialogue between business and education. We are now much closer to speaking the same "Language".

12. We have successfully moved off the starting point of workplace education and on to new and higher levels in education, employee training and development and life long learning.

Tel. (207) 548-2913

Clayton M. Blood, Sr. Associates
Old Route One, Box 96
Searsport, Maine 04974

EXTERNAL EVALUATOR REPORT

of

NATIONAL WORKPLACE LITERACY PROGRAM

SANFORD PUBLIC SCHOOLS

263 Main Street
Sanford, Maine 04073

P/R Award #: U198A10215
Award Period: 3/1/91 - 8/31/92

Submitted by:
Clayton M. Blood, Sr. Associates
Old Route 1 Box 96
Searsport, Maine 04974

Clayton M. Blood Sr.
Clayton M. Blood, Sr.
External Evaluator

GENERAL STATEMENT

In compliance with the National Workplace Literacy Program guidelines, Clayton M. Blood, Sr. Associates has evaluated the project's effectiveness in achieving its objectives.

We assessed the project's progress at the mid-point of the project and encouraged several operational modifications for the betterment of the project. This final report (The External Evaluator's Report) will look at how well the program operators implemented the design and operational plans that they submitted for funding; what outcomes are being achieved; and how the program could be modified to make it more effective.

Clayton M. Blood, Sr. Associates arrived at their conclusions for this project by:

(1) Attending three Partner Council meetings. At each of these sessions we had a chance to talk with all participants regarding progress, including the Business Partners.

(2) John Manzo's (the Project Coordinator) excellent Performance Report - both mid-year and final. We also met with John on four occasions and had six telephone calls in which we discussed the project.

(3) Personnel discussions with the Project Director, Project Supervisor and Teachers. These were on-going, which led to continuous evaluation.

(4) We examined the Record System of the project and looked at many individual folders.

(5) We met on two occasions with Phillips and Company, the consulting firm that did the employee assessment for the project.

(6) The External Evaluator requested and received a written statement of the program's strengths and weaknesses from the Project Director, Supervisor and each of the teachers.

(7) We reviewed a summary of two of the Project Partner's evaluations of the project.

STATEMENT OF FACT

Below we've listed the key people involved in this project and comments that the External Evaluator concludes:

A. Project Director: Leonard D. McGinnis, B.S., M.Ed., Director of the Sanford Community Adult Education Program.

Mr. McGinnis is one of the most outstanding leaders of the Adult Field in Maine, New England and the Nation. His reputation has been a powerful force in the direction of this project. His leadership style allows everyone to exhibit their own strengths and still contribute as a team player.

B. Project Supervisor: Janet E. Kalman, B.S., Coordinator of Basic Education for Sanford Community Adult Education program.

Janet is one of the outstanding Basic Education professionals. She has been very active in Staff Development Training for other supervisors and teachers in Maine. She did an outstanding job of sharing her skills in curriculum-building and teacher-training with the staff of this project.

C. Project Coordinator: John Manzo.

John was hired by the Project Director and Project Supervisor as the Project Coordinator in the early stages of the Program. John Manzo has been a most important factor in the success of this project. He has exhibited outstanding leadership ability and has been able to coordinate the total group into a very positive and energetic team. John was on the job the same month the project started, which was instrumental in its success.

D. Partner's Council:

This Council met several times during the year. They were involved in the planning and direction-setting of the project. This Council was most effective in developing ideas, discussing area of concerns and as a continuing evaluation group. The External Evaluators were present at three of these sessions and observed first-hand the progress of the project.

The Council members were:

Leonard D. McGinnis - Project Director

Janet E. Kalman - Project Supervisor

John Manzo - Project Coordinator

David Jagger - President, Jagger Bros. Inc.

Kimberly Lachance - Personnel Supervisor, Jagger Bros. Inc.

Suzanne Picard - Human Resource Specialist, Sprague Electric Co.

Tracy Pierpont - Training Director, Sprague Electric Co.

Conrad Pullen - Production Manager, Baker Co.

Sarah Eagleson - Production Planner, Baker Co.

Sheila Palmer - Associate Director, Sanford-Springvale Chamber of Commerce

Kenneth Scott - Director of Sanford's Goodall Library

Faith Ballenger - Chairman, Sanford Board of Selectmen

E. Other Personnel:

Four instructors and a secretary were hired to work on this project. Through our interviews and personal observations, these people were very professional, dedicated individuals with a great amount of enthusiasm for the project.

The External Evaluators received a lengthy summary of each of these people's involvement in the project and their opinions on strengths and weaknesses. The personnel were involved in several staff development activities and staff meetings were held to keep an open communication.

The external Evaluators' assessment of the project's effectiveness in achieving its stated objectives.

OBJECTIVE 1: That three local employers would be enlisted and a partnership developed:

Response: The Baker Company
Jagger Brothers
Vishay-Sprague

These three employers were enlisted and worked cooperatively throughout the Grant. All three employers were able and willing to provide class room space during the grant period.

OBJECTIVE 2: That ten (10) low level readers functioning at the 0-4 reading level and thirty-two (32) intermediate level readers functioning at the 5-12 reading level recruited from three partners place of employment and given two hours of instruction per week:

Response: 115 employees were enrolled in the 0-4 reading and writing classes. (NOTE: reading and writing were used as a combination at the request of the employers.)

11 employees were enrolled in at least two hours of instruction. This was low because of the low level of the employees.

OBJECTIVE 3: That ten (10) employees functioning at the 0-4 writing level and thirty-two (32) recruited from the three (3) partner corporations and placed in a classroom of a minimum of two (2) hours per week:

Response: (see response to Objective 2.)

Evaluators note: this gave a total in reading and writing of 126 employees enrolled in classes, which was 42 higher than the original goal. They combined the original goals in both writing and reading.

OBJECTIVE 4: That forty-seven (47) employees functioning at the 0-4 math level and one hundred twenty-two (122) employees functioning at the 5-12 math level recruited from the partner companies and placed in a minimum two (2) hours class period per week:

Response: From the Performance Report 185 employees were enrolled in classes for at least two hours per week in the 0-4 math level, and one (1) was enrolled in the 5-12 category. (This again caused by the low level of workers.)

The totals were 186 enrolled; up from 17 from the goals.

OBJECTIVE 5: That seventy-five (75) employees recruited from partner corporations with limited English proficiency enrolled in a minimum two (2) hour class period per week:

Response: There were 28 employees enrolled in limited English proficiency classes. This total was down by 47 employees.
Our evaluation concludes that this was due to two factors:

1. Many of the ESL potential employees chose to sign up for English and writing classes, and
2. the employers over-estimated the potential numbers.

OBJECTIVE 6: That three hundred twenty-eight (328) student employees were recruited, tested, evaluated and counseled as to their instructional format:

Response: A total of 859 employees were recruited, tested, evaluated and counseled as to their instructional format. This was an increase of 72% over the original objective.

OBJECTIVE 7: That three hundred twenty-eight (328) student employees receive Individual Education Plans (IEP).

(Objective 7 - cont'd)

Response: The results of the objective were most successful. Three hundred forty (340) student employees received Individual Education Plans. This was possible in part to a very good system created by Learning Unlimited, a private company through a process of placement tests and diagnostic testing yielded a computerized IEP in math and language.

OBJECTIVE 8: That ninety percent (90%) of the student employees who completed the IEP raise at least one level:

Response: In looking at all the data collected by the Administration (please see pages 5 through 10 of the Performance Report), we feel that this objective was met. Not quite all individuals raised at least one level, but this was due to a number of students at a very low level of literacy skills to start with.

OBJECTIVE 9: That any non-credentialed student employee increase his or her literacy by earning a high school diploma, Credit, or GED:

Response: This objective was highly successful. A system was established to award academic credit for each forty-five (45) hours of instruction received. This will be an on-going developing project towards High School Completion. Some students were held back because of their company's desire for all employees to finish the very basic literacy skills before moving on.

OBJECTIVE 10: That ninety-five percent (95%) of the student employees increase literacy and math skills to continue present employment during the project period:

(Objective 10 cont'd)

Response: The employers indicated through careful study that 93% did continue employment. Out of the 7% who did not, it is possible some may have left for better jobs because of increased literacy and math skills.

OBJECTIVE 11: That seventy-five (75) of the student employees who completed the IEP and courses qualify for company advanced training:

Response: Even though many more student employees completed the IEP and courses than planned, 85% did qualify for their company's advanced training programs.

OBJECTIVE 12: That fifty percent (50%) will qualify for and five percent (5%) receive career advancements during the project period because of increased math and literacy skills:

Response: The employers involved would not use this as the only reason that individuals received or qualified for career advancement. As the Evaluator, we believe more training for managers and foremen in the work place would help to identify these individuals. The three employers did, however, list 22% of the individuals who reached this goal. (NOTE: see comment in Summary E regarding this.)

OBJECTIVE 13: That at least fifty percent (50%) of student employees received proof of improved job performance and productivity from their immediate supervisors:

Response: This objective proved the most difficult to measure. The administrators of the project continually worked to get evidence of this achievement. The employers were hesitant too that this was the only reason for improved job performance. As the third party evaluator, we feel that with our educational background, we can accurately state that this objective was met, despite having no hard data.

S U M M A R Y

As the External Evaluators, we will summarize the major points regarding this total project.

A. BUDGET AND RECORD SYSTEM:

An outstanding system of Budget Control was developed and carried out by the Administrators of this Project. Mr. Len McGinnis, the Project Director and Mr. John Manzo, Project Coordinator, had developed a good budget and followed it extremely well. They at all times were aware of where the money was and where it was going. A large percentage of the available dollars was utilized in the Instructional Account.

B. RECORD SYSTEM:

We were most impressed with the record system developed by the Project Administrators and especially John Manzo, the Project Coordinator. All pertinent information was available in the files we checked. A back-up system was used to detail the records in all cases that we viewed.

C. TESTING AND DEVELOPING IEP:

The hiring of Phillips & Co. as a private consulting firm was a very positive step in this project. They established their program, Learning Unlimited, and allowed for a tremendous amount of interviewing, testing, evaluation and establishing of IEPs.

D. THE PERFORMANCE REPORT:

This report as compiled by Mr. John Manzo and his staff is highly commendable. He has provided a tremendous amount of statistical material that backs up their areas of completion.

E. THE BUSINESS PARTNERS INVOLVEMENT:

The three Business Partners have been very dedicated towards helping to make this project work. The largest employers, Vishay-Sprague, was involved in a company buy-out which caused considerable delay in getting the project under way. They also decided as a company to test the entire Production Department. This caused another delay, which meant that classes could not start until February of 1992. Because of these two uncontrollable factors, some of the objectives (no's 12 and 13) did not have a full year to obtain positive results. Perhaps, the most difficult portion of this entire project is to expect the Business Partners to go by plan when they have other external and internal pressures from other directions.

FINAL STATEMENT

It is our opinion that this Project was extremely successful. In our evaluation, we can find no problem areas. As in any new venture, our growing pains do occur and our entire Education and Business Partnership need time to totally work together for everyone's best results. Had the Instruction (by some magical power) been able to start at the Project's beginning, we are positive that even greater results would have been achieved.

Mr. Len McGinnis and Mr. John Manzo should be very proud of this new venture in changing our Educational world to work closely with Business. Their community is much richer because of this Project.

In closing, a timely statement made at the Partners' Council Meeting by Conrad Pullen, Production Manager of Baker:

> "I know good things are happening and real education is taking place simply by walking through the area where classes are being held. Our workers are smiling and feel better about themselves. How can we not be a better company for it!"